

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7, 9, 10, 12-14, 16, 17, 21-24, 29-36, 41-43 and 45-51 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-5, 7, 14, 16 and 21-24 are amended. The amendments introduce no new matter. Reconsideration of the application based on the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies shown to Applicant's representative by Examiner Vu in the April 2, 2008 personal interview. Applicant's separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 4, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 17, 31, 35, 43, 48, 50 and 51 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,308,023 to Nomura et al. (hereinafter "Nomura") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,121,968 to Arcuri et al. (hereinafter "Arcuri") and U.S. Patent No. 6,70,667 to Hattori et al. (hereinafter "Hattori"); and rejects the remaining claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Nomura, Hattori and Arcuri, and further in view of at least one of U.S. Patents Nos. 6,469,719 to Kino et al. (hereinafter "Kino"); 5,754,179 to Hocker et al. (hereinafter "Hocker"); and 5,625,783 to Ezekiel et al. (hereinafter "Ezekiel"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Without conceding the interpretation, or application, of the applied references, and solely to advance prosecution of this application, independent claims 1-5 and 14 are amended to clarify relevant features. As discussed during the April 2, 2008 personal interview, the applied references do not teach, nor can they reasonably be considered to have suggested, such features. For example, the applied references would not have reasonably suggested at least the features of a display arrangement control device that judges functions added to the image forming apparatus, that determines where to position images to be displayed in the display, each of the images to be displayed indicating a function which is judged to be added to the image forming apparatus, and that displays the images on the display according to the

determined positioning, as recited in claim 1. Claims 2-5 and 14 recite similar features.

During the April 2, 2008 personal interview, the Examiner agreed that the applied references would not have reasonably suggested these features, pending further search and consideration. Applicant appreciates this agreement by the Examiner. Applicant also maintains that the asserted combinations of references is unreasonable for at least the following reasons.

The present subject matter is directed to, among other objects, a display arrangement control that judges functions added to an image forming apparatus and determines an arrangement of images to be displayed. A plurality of images are displayed in a first case, and less than all of the plurality of images displayed in the first case are displayed in a second case. The arrangement is determined in various ways including (1) so that at least one image is displayed in a position which is different in the first case than in the second case (claims 1 and 14); (2) at least one image is displayed in a size which is different in the first case than in the second case (claim 2); (3) at least one image is displayed in a shape which is different in the first case than in the second case (claim 3); (4) images are displayed with a larger interval between the images in the second case than in the first case (claim 4); and (5) the images are displayed in a larger size in the second case than in the first case (claim 5).

The Office Action relies on Nomura only as teaching a display that displays an image indicating a function, and allows a user to instruct the image forming apparatus to perform the function by selecting the image. The Office Action refers to Figs. 6-10 of Nomura as allegedly teaching the relied-upon features. However, Figs. 6-9, and Fig. 10, depict separate embodiments, with different functions, of Nomura. Specifically, Figs. 6-9 depict separate individual control screens that are activated by mode selectors 70-72, depicted in Fig. 4 of Nomura. For example, pressing the "copy" button 72 would activate the copy control screen 100 depicted in Fig. 6. On the contrary, Fig. 10 depicts an embodiment in which the

information tables for individual functional modes are superimposed over one another, and each information table is provided with a tab 501, so that all the tabs in the upper part are always displayed. When a desired tab 501 is touched, the information table of the function comes to appear to the front-most layer of the display screen, allowing the user to check the conditions of the function. The Office Action relies on Hattori, Arcuri and Kino as allegedly disclosing other features of, for example, independent claims 1-5 and 14, not present in Nomura.

However, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have arrived at the subject matter of the independent claims based on the asserted modifications of Nomura. For example, with regard to claims 1-5 and 14, the Office Action concedes that Nomura does not disclose, as previously recited, a display arrangement control device that judges functions provided to the image performing apparatus, that determines an arrangement of images to be displayed, each of the images to be displayed indicating a function provided to the image forming apparatus, and that displays the image on the display according to the determined arrangement. The Office Action relies on Hattori as disclosing these features. The Office Action asserts that it would have been obvious to include the alleged teachings of Hattori in order to provide an image processing device that can process image information and additionally perform fax communication operations.

However, Nomura already apparently provides for a facsimile function as evidenced by Figs. 7 and 10. As such, the Office Action fails to provide an explicit obviousness analysis with some rational underpinning regarding why one of ordinary skill in the art would have modified Nomura to include the allegedly corresponding features of Hattori. Moreover, as argued previously, Hattori can not reasonably be considered to have suggested how any corresponding display is arranged, or that the arrangement is "determined" based on a

corresponding "judgment." In Hattori the arrangement of a particular display is not based on the addition of functions.

Similarly, there is no indication that the combination of Nomura and Hattori would have reasonably suggested determining or modifying an arrangement of any of the displays depicted in Figs. 6-10 based on a corresponding judgment. At most, the control screen depicted in Fig. 10 might be modified to reflect additional tabs 501. However, as discussed further below with respect to Arcuri, such a modification would still be insufficient to arrive at the subject matter of the pending claims.

The Office Action also asserts that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to further modify the combination of Nomura and Hattori to include the dynamic drop-down menus of Arcuri to dynamically change available selectable options "in a given short menu." As an initial matter, the combination of Nomura and Hattori would not have any corresponding "short menus" to modify in the manner suggested by the Office Action. Additionally, the conclusory statement of the Office Action, while describing the function of Arcuri, does not explain why one ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to further modify the alleged combination of Nomura and Hattori in such a manner.

Regarding claim 4, the Office Action does not correctly recite the features of the claim in the body of the rejection. Further, the Office Action does not adequately address the feature of determining the arrangement so that the images are displayed with a larger interval between the images in the second case than in the first case. The Office Action appears to rely on Arcuri for teaching this feature. However, Arcuri can not reasonably be considered to have suggested a larger interval between the images in the second case (in which less than all of the plurality of images displayed in the first case are displayed) than in the first case because, on the contrary, the elements in Arcuri maintain an equal interval or get closer when less elements are presented (*i.e.* in the short menu).

Regarding claim 3, the Office Action relies on Hocker as allegedly disclosing the feature of at least one image is displayed in a shape which is different in the first case than in the second case. However, Hocker is directed to changing the properties of displayed icons based on a relationship with a selected icon. This would not have reasonably suggested changing the shape of an icon displayed in (1) a first case, and (2) a second case in which less than all of the plurality of images displayed in the first case are displayed. In Hocker, it is the selection of icons, not the presence, or absence, of icons that instructs a change in the shape of an icon.

Regarding claims 13 and 48, the Office Action relies on Arcuri as allegedly teaching the features of wherein the images indicate options associated with a function, and the options associated with the function are displayed by selecting an image indicating the function. However, the interpretation of the Office Action appears to limit the application of Nomura to the images such as duplex copy key 106 or addition key 107, displayed within the display frame in Fig. 6, rather than the tabs 501 depicted in Fig. 10. Specifically, the tabs 501 do not indicate options associated with a function. Moreover, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the buttons depicted in the various control screens of Nomura based on the drop-down menus in Arcuri, as discussed above, and also because Nomura already identifies a method for customizing the presentation to account for information that is not frequently selected. Specifically, Nomura discloses that the "basic information," which is selected frequently, is depicted with an intense color, whereas the "special information," which is not frequently selected, is depicted with a non-intense color (see col. 12, lines 45-55 of Nomura).

Finally, regarding claims 50 and 51, the Office Action asserts that Arcuri allegedly teaches the feature of wherein a size of a range in which the images are displayed is the same in the first case and the second case. The Office Action refers to Figs. 2A and 2B of Arcuri as

allegedly disclosing this feature because "menu options are the same size." However, this is an unreasonable interpretation of the disclosure of Arcuri with respect to the features of claims 50 and 51. Specifically, Arcuri teaches that the short menu depicted in Fig. 2A occupies a smaller size of a range in which the images are displayed compared to the large menu depicted in Fig. 2B.

For at least the above reasons, the applied references cannot reasonably be considered to have suggested the combinations of the features positively recited in claims 1-5, 13, 14, 48, 50 and 51. Additionally, claims 7, 9, 10, 12, 16, 17, 21-24, 29-36, 41-43, 45-47 and 49 would also not have been reasonably suggested by the applied references for at least the respective dependence of these claims, directly or indirectly, on an allowable base claim, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-5, 7, 9, 10, 12-14, 16, 17, 21-24, 29-36, 41-43 and 45-51 over the applied references are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-5, 7, 9, 10, 12-14, 16, 17, 21-24, 29-36, 41-43 and 45-51 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

James E. Golladay, II
Registration No. 58,182

JAO:JEG/clf

Date: April 18, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--